



CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

July 24, 1998

S. 659

Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1998

*As ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works
on July 22, 1998*

SUMMARY

S. 659 would authorize the appropriation of \$8 million for each of the fiscal years 1999-2003 to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in the Department of the Interior for fish and wildlife restoration activities in the Great Lakes Basin.

CBO estimates that implementing S. 659 would result in outlays of about \$8 million in fiscal year 1999 and of \$40 million over the 1999-2003 period, assuming appropriation of the authorized amounts. Because S. 659 would not affect direct spending or receipts, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply.

S. 659 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

DESCRIPTION OF THE BILL'S MAJOR PROVISIONS

S. 659 would authorize the appropriation of \$3.5 million for each of the fiscal years 1999-2003 for the operation of the three offices that coordinate all USFWS activities in the Great Lakes Basin: the Great Lakes Coordination Office, the Upper Great Lakes Fishery Resources Office, and the Lower Great Lakes Fishery Resources Office. These offices also provide administrative and technical support to carry out these activities. The previous authorization of appropriations for these offices expired in fiscal year 1995.

S. 659 also would authorize the appropriation of \$4.5 million for each of the fiscal years 1999-2003 for the federal costs associated with implementing fish and wildlife restoration projects approved by the Director of USFWS. The bill would establish a Great Lakes Fish

and Wildlife Restoration Proposal Review Commission, composed of representatives of states and Indian tribes to evaluate proposed projects. Under S. 659, at least 25 percent of the total cost of implementing a proposal would have to be paid by nonfederal sources in cash or through in-kind contributions. The bill also would direct USFWS to prepare a report on the review, implementation, and results of fish and wildlife restoration proposals in the Great Lakes Basin by December 31, 2002.

ESTIMATED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The estimated budgetary impact of S. 659 is shown in the following table. For the purposes of this estimate, CBO assumes that the amounts authorized for these USFWS programs will be appropriated near the start of each fiscal year and that outlays will follow historical patterns for similar activities. We also assume that nonfederal sources will provide matching contributions for restoration proposals on a timely basis. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 300 (natural resources and the environment).

	By Fiscal Year, in Millions of Dollars					
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION						
Spending Under Current Law						
Budget Authority ^a	2	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	1	b	b	b	0	0
Proposed Changes						
Authorization Level	0	8	8	8	8	8
Estimated Outlays	0	7	8	8	8	8
Spending Under S. 659						
Authorization Level ^a	2	8	8	8	8	8
Estimated Outlays	1	8	8	8	8	8

a. The 1998 level is the amount appropriated for that year.

b. Less than \$500,000.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO CONSIDERATIONS: None.

ESTIMATED IMPACT ON STATE, LOCAL, AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS

S. 659 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments. State or tribal governments that seek and receive federal funds for fish and wildlife restoration projects, as authorized by this bill, would be required to pay at least 25 percent of the projects' costs. In addition, state and tribal governments would incur some minor costs should they choose to participate in the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Proposal Review Committee. These costs would be incurred voluntarily.

ESTIMATED IMPACT ON THE PRIVATE SECTOR

S. 659 contains no private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA.

ESTIMATE PREPARED BY:

Federal Costs: Victoria V. Heid

Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Marjorie Miller

ESTIMATE APPROVED BY:

Robert A. Sunshine

Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis